

REMARKS

The Examiner is reminded that the undersigned attorney is of record in this application. Nevertheless, the aforementioned Office Action was sent directly to the applicant rather than to the undersigned. Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner correct the file so that all further communications concerning this application will be directed to the undersigned attorney pursuant to a Power of Attorney that was filed in this application on November 10, 2003.

The claims remaining in this patent application following Amendment are Claims 9 and 11-14. Claim 10 has been cancelled, without prejudice. Claims 9 and 11 have been amended. No new claims are presented.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Watkins, et al. (5,813,063). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 10 has been cancelled and all of the essential features thereof added to Independent Claim 9. Therefore, the rejection to former Claim 10 is now rendered moot.

There is simply nothing in Watkins which is the same as or equivalent to the applicant's portable water dispensing station including a control valve (12) having open and closed positions and being operable to selectively connect a water pump (3) to a fluid coupling (11) when said control valve is in the open position or to a fresh water reservoir (10) when said control valve is in the closed position so that fresh water can be pumped to a faucet from an external water supply or from the fresh water reservoir as now recited by the applicant in Independent Claim 1, amended. In this same regard, it should be recognized that the applicant's water pump (3) is always connected to

either the fluid coupling (11) or to the reservoir (10) regardless of the position of the control valve (12).

In making his rejection, the Examiner acknowledges that Watkins does not connect an external source of water to a water pump. Therefore, there is absolutely no reason for Watkins to include a control valve like that claimed by the applicant having open and closed positions to be operated to selectively permit fresh water to be supplied to a faucet from either one of an external water source or from an external water reservoir depending upon the position of the control valve. In fact, Watkins never incorporates a water pump and his pressure regulator in the same fluid line to a faucet at the same time. More particularly, if an external water source is used, the electric pump of Watkins is avoided, such that water flows through the pressure regulator and directly to the faucet. If an internal water source is otherwise used, the pressure regulator of Watkins does not operate and water flows from the internal source to the faucet via the water pump.

Unlike Watkins, neither the applicant's control valve nor his water pump as recited in Independent Claim 1, amended, is pressure responsive. Therefore, the applicant's water pump is always operational regardless of the position of the control valve or whether a source of external or internal water is supplied to a faucet. Clearly, the check valve described by Watkins does not perform the same function or operate in open and closed positions as does the control valve recited by the applicant.

Any reconfiguration of Watkins by which to include a control valve having open and closed positions and a rerouting of fluid hoses so that the control valve is at all times connected to a fluid pump would be based entirely on hindsight. That is to say, and as indicated above, because the

Watkins system is pressure responsive, such a reconfiguration to include a control valve always interconnected with a fluid pump and the faucet is not needed or recognized by Watkins and would otherwise be avoided as redundant. It is the applicant's water pump which constantly controls water pressure, not a pressure regulator like that required by Watkins.

Accordingly, it is submitted that there is no teaching or motivation provided by Watkins which would encourage one of ordinary skill to completely redesign the system of Watkins to first include a multi-position control valve and then route an external source of water through a water pump by way of the control valve moved to an open position in the manner recited by the applicant in Independent Claim 1, amended. Therefore, it is believed that Independent Claim 1, amended, is patentable over any reasonable interpretation of Watkins, et al. Inasmuch as Independent Claim 1 is believed to be patentable, Claims 11-14, which depend therefrom, are likewise believed to be patentable.

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over the aforementioned patent to Watkins, et al. in view of the patent to Maddox (6,173,458). Claims 12-14 are dependent from Independent Claim 1. Inasmuch as Independent Claim 1 is believed to be patentable, Claims 11-14 are likewise believed to be patentable.

In view of the foregoing, each of Claims 9 and 11-14 remaining in this patent application following amendment is believed to recite a patentable portable water dispensing station. Accordingly, reconsideration of the Examiner's final rejection is requested and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Morland C. Fischer
Attorney for the applicant
2030 Main Street, Suite 1050
Irvine, California 92614
Telephone (949) 476-0600
Facsimile (949) 476-0606

May 9, 2005

Dated